

In the rejection, the Examiner contends that “Kido discloses a ‘mixed layer’ charge generation layer between an electrode and a light emitting layer.” However, Kido teaches that “[t]he light-emissive units are partitioned from each other by at least one charge generation layer.” See e.g. the Abstract in Kido. As shown, for example, in Fig. 8 in Kido, Kido does not teach a mixed layer which is provided between one electrode and a light emitting layer which is nearest to the one electrode in the plurality of light emitting layers, as in the present invention.

Therefore, since Kido does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of **each** of the plurality of light emitting units comprising a light emitting layer and a mixed layer comprising an organic compound and a metal oxide of Claims 1 and 17, independent Claims 1 and 17 are not disclosed or suggested by Kido.

With regard to independent Claims 18 and 19, these claims recite the features of a first light emitting unit comprises a first mixed layer in direct contact with the first electrode and a first light emitting layer over the first mixed layer.

As described above, Kido teaches that “[t]he light-emissive units are partitioned from each other by at least one charge generation layer.” Hence, even if one were to argue that the claimed mixed layer is deemed as a single layer or multiple layers of inorganic and organic layer as the Examiner contends in the rejection (which Applicants do not admit), a layer corresponding to the claimed first mixed layer which is in contact with one electrode in the first light emitting unit cannot be found in Kido. Instead, Kido discloses a light emissive layer in the light emissive unit nearest to the one electrode and the alleged mixed layer charge generation layer is not in contact with the electrode. Hence, Kido does not disclose or suggest the claimed first mixed layer wherein the first mixed layer is in direct contact with the first electrode or anode, as in Claims 18 and 19, and therefore, independent Claims 1 and 17 are not disclosed or suggested by Kido.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 17-19 are not disclosed or suggested by Kido, and Claims 1, 17-19 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Kido. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants filed an information disclosure statement (IDS) on April 29, 2011 with certification under 37 CFR §1.97(d) and (e). It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this response, please charge our deposit account 23-0920.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: July 11, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

Husch Blackwell LLP
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 526-1533

Customer No. 24628